arXiv:1212.1871v1 [hep-th] 9 Dec 2012

The linearization of thick K-branes

Yuan Zhong[a], Yu-Xiao Liu[b]
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Lanzhou University,
Lanzhou 730000, Peoples Republic of China

Abstract

In this paper, thick K-branes refer to four-dimensional domain walls generated by a scalar field with non-standard kinetic term. We first give a gauge independent description of the linear perturbations of a wide class of thick K-brane models. Then we decompose the original metric perturbation into 4 scalars, 2 transverse vectors and a transverse-traceless (TT) tensor. We show that each type of these perturbation modes evolves independently. As compared to the standard case, equations of both vector and tensor perturbations are not modified. On the contrary, the non-standard kinetic terms usually cause modifications to the mass spectrum and effective potential of the scalar perturbation. In order to reduce the scalar perturbation equations into a Schrödinger like equation, a constraint on the matter Lagrangian is needed. This constraint might be useful in modeling K-branes.

PACS numbers: 04.50.-h, 11.27.+d, 98.80.Cq

---

[a] zhongy2009@lzu.cn

[b] liuyx@lzu.edu.cn, corresponding author.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is not a new idea that our world might be some topological defects, such as a Nielsen-Olesen vortex in a six-dimensional [1], or a domain wall in a five-dimensional [2] flat space-time. Instead of the conventional idea of "compactification", a creative idea called dynamical localization was applied in these models. As a result, non-compacted extra dimensions are allowed, and in the low energy everything are trapped on these topological defects. In the 1990's, it was found that warped extra dimensions can be very useful in solving some fundamental problems, such as the hierarchy problem and the cosmological constant problem [3, 4], see also [5–7] for reviews. In [3, 4], branes were called thin branes, because the thicknesses of branes were assumed to be zero.

It is a natural idea to generalize the original vortex world or domain wall world scenarios to space-time with warped geometry [8–25]. Such models are also known as the thick brane models, because branes in these models usually have non-zero widthes, see [26] for review of thick brane solutions in various interesting cases. For some of the recent developments see [27–38].

One of the important issues in brane world models with large extra dimensions, is the trapping of various kinds of bulk matter fields on either thin or thick branes, see [39–45] for the localization of gauge fields, and [46–58] for fermion and scalar fields. The localization of p-form fields [59–66], and the Elko spinors [67] were considered recently.

However, before we discuss the localization of bulk fields, we should first verify that the brane solution is stable. To discuss the stability of branes, we need to consider linear perturbations of the background brane solution. If no tachyon appears in the spectra of the perturbation modes, we say the background solution is stable, otherwise, the solution is unstable, see [17, 19]. Besides, to reproduce the four-dimensional gravity on the brane, we need to localize the zero mode of tensor perturbation [4, 15, 17, 68]. Some modifications to four-dimensional Newtonian's law of gravity can also be obtained by analyzing the linear structure of thick brane models [15, 17, 69]. Thus, the linearization is very important in modeling thick brane models.

In most thick brane models, branes are generated by single (or multi) real scalar field(s) with standard kinetic term(s). However, it is also possible to construct thick branes by using scalar fields with non-standard kinetic terms [70–81]. Scalar fields with non-standard kinetic terms (also called as K-fields) appears in the low energy effective action of string theory, and can be applied to describe the inflation of early Universe [82–84]. So the generalization from the standard thick branes to the K-branes is both interesting and physically important.

The fermion localization on some K-branes, was considered, for example, in [72, 78]. As to the issue of linearization of K-brane, some previous works can be summarized as follows:

- in [73, 74], stability of the domain wall solution under linear perturbation of the scalar field was considered. However, since these models involve gravity, the metric perturbation should also be considered. Usually, the metric perturbation couples to the scalar field perturbation, which renders the problem rather difficult to solve.

- The tensor perturbation of thick K-branes and the localization of gravity were discussed in [76]. It was found that the tensor perturbation decouples from the K-field perturbation.

- The scalar metric perturbations of thick K-brane are, to our knowledge, not yet been discussed systematically. In fact, the issue of stability of thin brane models under scalar perturbations has been investigated in [85–87] by using non-standard bulk scalar fields. However the scalar fields in [85–87] are not used to generate the brane, but to stabilize the distance between thin branes via the Goldberger-Wise mechanism [88, 89]. So, the branes in [85–87] are not K-branes in our definition. Therefore, we need a refresh discussion on the scalar perturbations of thick K-branes.

In this paper, we try to give a general and systematical discussion on the linearization of a large class of K-brane models. In section II, we present the K-brane model in a general form, and give the background dynamical equations. The linearization of our model as well as the issue of gauge freedoms in linear perturbation equations are generally discussed in section III. In section IV, we simplify the linear perturbation equations by using the scalar, tensor and vector (STV) decompositions of the metric perturbations. Some gauge-invariant variables are constructed and used in the perturbation equations. The issues of stability, localization of metric perturbation are discussed in section V. In the end, we give a brief summary and stress some possible applications of our results.

II. K-BRANE MODEL AND BACKGROUND EQUATIONS

In the model with a single K-field, the most general action for thick branes is given by

$$S = S_g + S_m = \int d^5x\sqrt{-g}\left(\frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2}R + \mathcal{L}(\phi, X)\right), \tag{1}$$

where $\kappa_5^2 = 8\pi G_5$ is the gravitational coupling constant and G_5 is the five-dimensional Newtonian constant. We use $X \equiv -\frac{1}{2}g^{MN}\nabla_M\phi\nabla_N\phi$ to denote the kinetic term of the scalar field, so that the standard lagrangian density is given by $\mathcal{L} = X - V(\phi)$. In this paper, we always use $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ to denote the indices of brane coordinates, and use $M, N = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5$ to represent the indices of bulk coordinates.

The Einstein equations are

$$R_{MN} - \frac{1}{2}g_{MN}R = \kappa_5^2 T_{MN}, \tag{2}$$

where

$$T_{MN} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\delta S_m}{\delta g^{MN}} = g_{MN}\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_X\nabla_M\phi\nabla_N\phi \tag{3}$$

is the energy-momentum tensor.

The metric for domain wall brane is assumed to be

$$ds^2 = a^2(y)\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2, \tag{4}$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(-,+,+,+)$ is the four-dimensional Minkowski metric. $y = x^5$ represents the extra dimension. The warp factor $a^2(y)$ is an even function of y.

It is more convenient for us to start with a conformal flat metric:

$$g_{MN} = a^2(r)\eta_{MN}. \tag{5}$$

This metric relates with metric (4) via a redefinition of the fifth coordinate $dr \equiv a^{-1}dy$. Starting from the conformal metric, we immediately obtain the expressions for the connection, the Ricci curvature and the scalar curvature

$$\Gamma^P_{MN} = \frac{1}{a}(\delta^P_N\partial_M a + \delta^P_M\partial_N a - \eta_{MN}\eta^{PQ}\partial_Q a), \tag{6}$$

$$R_{MN} = 6\frac{\partial_M a\partial_N a}{a^2} - 3\frac{\partial_M\partial_N a}{a} - 2\eta_{MN}\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2 - \eta_{MN}\frac{a''}{a}, \tag{7}$$

$$R = -4a^{-2}\left(\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2 + 2\frac{a''}{a}\right), \tag{8}$$

correspondingly. Primes denote derivatives with respect to r. Plugging these expressions into eq. (2) and use eq. (3) we obtain the Einstein equations

$$\begin{aligned} &6\frac{\partial_M a\partial_N a}{a^2} - 3\frac{\partial_M\partial_N a}{a} + 3\eta_{MN}\frac{a''}{a} \\ &= \kappa_5^2 a^2\eta_{MN}\mathcal{L} + \kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\nabla_M\phi\nabla_N\phi, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

or in component form:

$$6\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2 = \kappa_5^2 a^2\mathcal{L} + \kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'^2, \tag{10a}$$

$$3\frac{a''}{a} = \kappa_5^2 a^2\mathcal{L}. \tag{10b}$$

The equation of motion (EoM) for the scalar field is

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi + \nabla^M(L_X\nabla_M\phi) = 0. \tag{11}$$

As our metric (5) is considered, we have

$$\phi'\mathcal{L}'_X + \mathcal{L}_X\left(\phi'' + 3\frac{a'}{a}\phi'\right) = -a^2\mathcal{L}_\phi. \tag{12}$$

This equation can be derived from the Einstein equations as a natural result of the Bianchi identity $\nabla^N G_{MN} = 0$. Thus, the Einstein equations (10) constitute the independent and complete background dynamical equations and will be used frequently in the following discussions.

III. LINEARIZATION AND GAUGE FREEDOMS

In principle, one can find a lot of thick brane solutions by solving equations (10) and (12). However, not all the solutions of the dynamical equations are stable. To discuss the stability of thick K-branes, we have to analyze the linear structure of our model. If some tachyon modes appear in the spectrum of linear perturbations, then the corresponding K-brane solution is not stable.

In our model, K-field couples with gravity, so perturbations from both the metric and the K-field should be considered, so

$$g_{MN} = \bar{g}_{MN} + \delta g_{MN}, \quad \phi = \bar{\phi} + \delta\phi, \tag{13}$$

where $\bar{g}_{MN}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ are the background solutions which satisfy equations (10) and (12). δg_{MN} and $\delta\phi$ are small perturbations around the background solutions, both of them are functions of the whole bulk coordinates x^M. It is convenient for us to redefine the metric perturbation as

$$\delta g_{MN} = a^2 h_{MN}(x^\rho, r). \tag{14}$$

Since the perturbed metric g_{MN} should also satisfies the orthogonal relation $g_{MP}g^{PN} = \delta^N_M$, we immediately obtain

$$\delta g^{MN} = -a^2 \eta^{MP}\eta^{NQ}h_{PQ}. \tag{15}$$

Before we keep on the next step, let us first state some notations:

1. Note that usually $\partial^P = g^{PQ}\partial_Q$. However, since we have used the conformal flat metric, we frequently encounter term like $\eta^{PQ}\partial_Q$. So it is more convenient for us to denote $\partial^P \equiv \eta^{PQ}\partial_Q$ and $\partial^\mu \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu$ for simplicity. For the same reason, we denote $h^{MN} \equiv \eta^{MP}\eta^{NQ}h_{PQ}$, so that $\delta g^{MN} = -a^2 h^{MN}$ and $h = \eta^{MN}h_{MN}$.

2. $\Box^{(5)} \equiv \eta^{MN}\partial_M\partial_N \equiv \partial_M\partial^M$ and $\Box^{(4)} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu \equiv \partial_\mu\partial^\mu$ are d'Alamber operators defined with Minkowski metrics and the ordinary partial derivatives, obviously, $\Box^{(5)} = \Box^{(4)} + \partial_r\partial_r$.

3. The symmetrization of the indices M, N of a second order tensor $\mathcal{T}_{MN}$ is realized by using the symmetrization bracket, which is defied as

$$\mathcal{T}_{(MN)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathcal{T}_{MN} + \mathcal{T}_{NM}\right). \tag{16}$$

Note that the perturbation of the Einstein equation (2) is

$$\delta R_{MN} - \frac{1}{2}\delta g_{MN}R - \frac{1}{2}g_{MN}\delta R = \kappa_5^2\delta T_{MN}. \tag{17}$$

Plugging eq. (8), and (A2)-(A5) into above equation and after a simplification, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial^P\partial_{(M}h_{N)P}-\frac{1}{2}\left(\Box^{(5)}+3\frac{a'}{a}\partial_r\right)h_{MN}-2\frac{a'}{a}\frac{\partial_{(M}ah_{N)r}}{a}\\
&+3\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{(M}h_{N)r}+2\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2\eta_{r(M}h_{N)r}-\frac{1}{2}\partial_M\partial_N h+\eta_{MN}\mathcal{I}\\
&=2\kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\nabla_{(M}\phi\nabla_{N)}\delta\phi+\kappa_5^2\nabla_M\phi\nabla_N\phi\Big(\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}\delta\phi\\
&-\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'\delta\phi'+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'^2h_{rr}\Big),
\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}=&\frac{1}{2}\Box^{(5)}h-\frac{1}{2}\partial^P\partial^Q h_{PQ}+\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_r h-3\frac{a'}{a}\partial^P h_{Pr}\\
&-3\frac{a''}{a}h_{rr}-\kappa_5^2\Big(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_X\phi'^2h_{rr}-\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi'+a^2\mathcal{L}_\phi\delta\phi\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

In component form, the perturbation equations are

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu,\nu):\quad &\partial_{(\mu}\partial^P h_{\nu)P}-\frac{1}{2}\Box^{(5)}h_{\mu\nu}-\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_r h_{\mu\nu}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu h+3\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{(\mu}h_{\nu)r}+\eta_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{I}=0,
\end{aligned}\tag{20a}$$

$$(\mu,r):\quad \partial_{(\mu}\partial^P h_{r)P}-\frac{1}{2}\Box^{(5)}h_{\mu r}+\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_\mu h_{rr}-\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\partial_r h=\kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\partial_\mu\delta\phi,\tag{20b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(r,r):\quad &\partial_r\partial^P h_{Pr}-\frac{1}{2}\Box^{(5)}h_{rr}+\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_r h_{rr}-\frac{1}{2}\partial_r\partial_r h+\mathcal{I}=2\kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi'\\
&+\kappa_5^2\phi'^2\Big(\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}\delta\phi-\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'\delta\phi'+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'^2h_{rr}\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{20c}$$

These equations describe the evolution of the linear perturbations for the most general case. However, there are some gauge freedoms still exist in the perturbations. To see why, let us recall the general covariant principle, which states that the dynamical equations should be independent from our preference of coordinate systems. So under an infinitesimal coordinate transformation

$$x^M\rightarrow\tilde{x}^M=x^M+\xi^M(x^P),\tag{21}$$

an arbitrary second order tensor should transforms as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(\tilde{x}^Q)=\frac{\partial x^J}{\partial\tilde{x}^M}\frac{\partial x^K}{\partial\tilde{x}^N}\mathcal{T}_{JK}(x^Q).\tag{22}$$

Just like we have done in eq. (13), we can split $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}$ as a background field plus a small perturbation:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(\tilde{x}^Q)=\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(\tilde{x}^Q)+\delta\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(\tilde{x}^Q),\tag{23}$$

then, under linear approximation, transformation in (22) is equivalent to the following gauge transformation of the linear perturbation:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(x^Q) = {} & \delta\mathcal{T}_{MN}(x^Q) - \partial_M\xi^P\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{PN}(x^Q) \\ & - \partial_N\xi^P\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{PM}(x^Q) - \xi^P\partial_P\overline{\mathcal{T}}_{MN}(x^Q).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

As the metric tensor is concerned, we have

$$\Delta h_{MN} \equiv \widetilde{h}_{MN} - h_{MN} = -2\xi_{(M,N)} - 2\eta_{MN}\frac{a'}{a}\xi^r, \tag{25}$$

where $\xi_M \equiv \eta_{MN}\xi^N$ and "Δ" indicates the change of perturbations.

For scalar field perturbation, the gauge transformation can be obtained by following similar discussions (see [90] for details):

$$\Delta\delta\phi = -\xi^r\bar{\phi}'. \tag{26}$$

It can be shown that, under the gauge transformation (25) and (26), the linear perturbation equation (18) is invariant. In other words, $(\delta\phi, h_{MN})$ and $(\widetilde{\delta\phi}, \widetilde{h}_{MN})$ satisfy same equations. This is an important information, because we can use these gauge freedoms to eliminate some of the perturbations. A simple example is that we will have $\widetilde{\delta\phi} = 0$, if we take

$$\xi^r = \frac{\delta\phi}{\bar{\phi}'}. \tag{27}$$

Likewise, we can eliminate some other perturbations by using the residual freedoms of choosing ξ^μ.

So, on one hand, we have to eliminate all these freedoms because they are not physical. While on the other hand, these gauge freedoms allows us to working in some particular coordinate systems in which the perturbation equations are relatively easier to solve. Indeed, we have different ways in eliminating the gauge freedoms.

The first choice is to take gauges directly, just as we have shown in the example above, see also [91–94]. Some authors prefer to take gauges in the light-cone coordinates [95–99]. However, it is difficult to eliminate all the gauge freedoms completely if we directly take gauges.

Nevertheless, if the space-time is highly symmetric, we can take gauges after decompose the metric perturbation into scalar, vector and tensor parts (the STV decomposition). This method was first used in cosmology, see [100–103] for original contributions and [104–107] for recent applications of this method in cosmology. The advantage of this method is that we can not only find some gauges which completely eliminating all the gauge freedoms, but also can construct gauge invariant quantities which can be treated as the physical dynamic variables when we try to quantize the perturbations [103]. This method was also generalized in brane world models [17, 19, 108–115] to analyze the stability of thin or thick brane models.

Beside these methods, the covariant and gauge-invariant approach is also a widely used method in analyzing perturbations [116]. This method is based on the $3+1$ decomposition of the space-time. For applications of this approach in brane world cosmology, see [117] and references therein.

In this paper, we will follow the second approach, the details can be found in standard text books such as [90, 106].

IV. STV DECOMPOSITION AND GAUGE INVARIANT VARIABLES

It is always possible to make the following decomposition (see [106] for how to realize this idea in cosmology):

$$h_{\mu r} = \partial_\mu F + G_\mu, \tag{28a}$$

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} A + \partial_\mu \partial_\nu B + 2\partial_{(\mu} C_{\nu)} + D_{\mu\nu}, \tag{28b}$$

where C_μ, G_μ are transverse vector perturbations:

$$\partial^\mu C_\mu = 0 = \partial^\mu G_\mu, \tag{29}$$

and $D_{\mu\nu}$ is transverse and traceless (TT) perturbation:

$$\partial^\nu D_{\mu\nu} = 0 = D^\mu_\mu. \tag{30}$$

Here all indices are raised with $\eta^{\mu\nu}$.

Using the properties of the decomposed metric perturbations, we can now figure out how these perturbations transform under gauge transformation (25). For scalar perturbations, we have

$$\Delta A = -2\frac{a'}{a}\xi^r, \quad \Delta h_{rr} = -2\xi^{r\prime} - 2\frac{a'}{a}\xi^r, \tag{31}$$

$$\Delta B = -2\zeta, \quad \Delta F = -\xi^r - \zeta'. \tag{32}$$

We have used the decomposition $\xi^\mu = \partial^\mu \zeta + \xi^{\perp\mu}$ with $\partial_\mu \xi^{\perp\mu} = 0$.

For vector and tensor perturbations we obtain

$$\Delta C_\mu = -\xi^\perp_\mu, \quad \Delta G_\mu = -\xi^{\perp\prime}_\mu, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\Delta D_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{34}$$

respectively. It is useful to define $\psi = F - \frac{1}{2}B'$ and $v_\mu = G_\mu - C_\mu{}'$. Obviously, $\Delta\psi = -\xi^r$, while $v_\mu, D_{\mu\nu}$ and the following scalar quantities are invariant under gauge transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Xi &\equiv h_{rr} - 2\frac{1}{a}\left(a\psi\right)', \\
\Psi &\equiv A - 2\frac{a'}{a}\psi, \\
\Phi &\equiv \delta\phi - \phi'\psi.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Now let us discuss the perturbation equations. Plugging eqs. (28) into eqs. (20), and using expressions in (A6) we obtain the following equations:

$$\psi' + 3\frac{a'}{a}\psi - A - \frac{1}{2}h_{rr} = 0, \tag{36}$$

$$\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{2}\Box^{(4)}A + \frac{1}{2}A'' + \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}A', \tag{37}$$

$$3\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{(\mu}v_{\nu)} + \partial_{(\mu}v'_{\nu)} = 0, \tag{38}$$

$$\Box^{(4)}D_{\mu\nu} + D''_{\mu\nu} + 3\frac{a'}{a}D'_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{39}$$

from the (μ,ν) components.

By using (19) and (A6), one can immediately obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I} = &\frac{1}{2}\Box^{(4)}A + 2A'' - \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}h_{rr}{}' + 6\frac{a'}{a}A' - 3\frac{a''}{a}h_{rr}\\ &- \kappa_5^2(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_X\phi'^2 h_{rr} - \mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi' + a^2 L_\phi\delta\phi),\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

However, as we will show below, we need not to plug this complex expression into the perturbation equations (for example, eq. (37)).

From the (μ, r) components we obtain

$$\Box^{(4)}v_\mu = 0, \tag{41}$$

$$\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}h_{rr} - \frac{3}{2}A' = \kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi. \tag{42}$$

Finally, the (r, r) component can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\Box^{(4)}\psi' - \frac{1}{2}\Box^{(4)}h_{rr} + \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}h_{rr}{}' - 2A'' + \mathcal{I} = 2\kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi'\\ &+\kappa_5^2\phi'^2(\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}\delta\phi - \mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'\delta\phi' + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'^2 h_{rr}).\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Obviously, different types of perturbation modes evolve independently. So we can analyze them separately.

The equations for vector and tensor perturbations are obviously gauge invariant. One can check that all the equations for scalar perturbations are also gauge invariant. If we plug the gauge invariant quantities defined in eq. (35) into the scalar perturbation equations (36) and (42), we would get

$$-\Psi - \frac{1}{2}\Xi = 0, \tag{44}$$

$$\frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\Xi - \frac{3}{2}\Psi' = \kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\Phi, \tag{45}$$

The third independent equation for scalar perturbation comes from eq. (43)

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{3}{2}\Box^{(4)}\Psi - \frac{3}{2}\Psi'' - \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\Psi' - \kappa_5^2\phi'^2\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'^2\Psi\\ &= 2\kappa_5^2\mathcal{L}_X\phi'\Phi' - \kappa_5^2\phi'^2\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'\Phi' + \kappa_5^2\phi'^2\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}\Phi.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Here, to eliminate $\mathcal{I}$ in eq. (43), we used eq. (37) rather than eq. (40).

Using gauge-invariant variables is one of the natural ways to eliminate the gauge freedoms in the perturbation equations, another way to achieve this goal is to take gauges. For example, by taking $\psi = 0$, $B = 0$ and $C_\mu = 0$, we can eliminate the gauge freedoms in ξ^r, ζ and $\xi^{\perp\mu}$, correspondingly. Under this gauge, $\{\Xi,\ \Psi,\ \Phi,\ v_\mu\}$ simply reduce to $\{h_{rr},\ A,\ \phi,\ G_\mu\}$ respectively. So, the final equations for $\{h_{rr},\ A,\ \phi\}$ are nothing but eqs.(44)-(46). The gauge we used here is called the longitudinal gauge, or conformal Newtonian gauge, which is widely used in literatures. Therefore, taking longitude gauge is totally equivalent to using the gauge invariant variables defined in eq. (35). Both methods completely eliminate the gauge freedoms in the perturbation equations.

Note that the construction of gauge-invariant variables is not unique. In fact, for any gauge that completely eliminates the gauge freedoms, we can always construct the corresponding gauge-invariant variables. A good choice of gauge usually helps us to simplify the perturbation equations. Usually, we can simplify the perturbation equations by simply taking the longitude gauge. However, for some special models, such as thick branes in $f(R)$ gravity [32], there might be some other gauges which are superior than the longitude gauge.

V. STABILITY AND LOCALIZATION OF ZERO MODES

Let us first consider the vector perturbation which is described by eq. (38) and eq. (41). If we expand v_μ as

$$v_\mu = \epsilon_\mu e^{ip_\lambda x^\lambda}\chi(r), \quad \partial^\mu \epsilon_\mu = 0, \tag{47}$$

then, eq. (41) indicates that $m^2 = -p_\lambda p^\lambda$ has to be vanished, namely, only the zero vector mode survives. Thus, any K-brane solution in our model is stable under the vector perturbation. From eq. (38), we get the expression of the vector zero mode:

$$\chi_0(r) \propto a^{-3}. \tag{48}$$

We can also expand tensor perturbation described by eq. (39), as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu} = t_{\mu\nu} a^{-3/2} e^{ip_\lambda x^\lambda}\rho(r), \quad \partial^\mu\partial^\nu t_{\mu\nu} = 0 = \eta^{\mu\nu} t_{\mu\nu}. \tag{49}$$

Then, eq. (39) can be written as (see also [76])

$$\left(\partial_r + \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\right)\left(\partial_r - \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\right)\rho(r) = -m^2\rho(r). \tag{50}$$

In the theory of supersymmetric quantum mechanics, the above factorized equation indicates that $m^2 \geq 0$, and thus K-brane solutions satisfying eqs. (10) are also stable under tensor perturbation. Note that the tensor zero mode is

$$\rho_0(r) \propto a^{3/2}. \tag{51}$$

In order to localize the zero mode of vector or tensor perturbation, we need

$$\int dr|\chi_0(r)|^2 = 1 \quad \text{or,} \quad \int dr|\rho_0(r)|^2 = 1. \tag{52}$$

However, as stated in [17], these two requirements cannot be satisfied simultaneously. In addition, if we demand a finite four-dimensional Planck mass, the zero mode of tensor perturbation should be localized on the brane. As a result, the vector zero mode cannot be localized.

Since the introducing of K-field does not change the equations for both vector and tensor perturbations. There is nothing new in the results as compared to the standard case $\mathcal{L} = X - V(\phi)$. Now, let us consider the non-trivial case, the scalar perturbations.

Plugging eqs. (44) and (45) into eq. (46) and after simplification, we obtain

$$\Box^{(4)}\Psi = \alpha_1\Psi + \alpha_2\Psi' + \alpha_3\Psi'', \tag{53}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1 &= H\Big(4\partial_r \ln(\mathcal{L}_X\phi') - 4\frac{H'}{H} - 2\frac{\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}}{\mathcal{L}_X}\phi' \\ &\quad -X\frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X}\Big[2\frac{H'}{H} - H - \partial_r\ln(\mathcal{L}_X\phi')\Big]\Big), &(54)\\ \alpha_2 &= 2\partial_r\ln(\mathcal{L}_X\phi') - 3H - \frac{\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}}{\mathcal{L}_X}\phi' \\ &\quad -X\frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X}\Big[-\frac{1}{2}\partial_r\ln(\mathcal{L}_X\phi') + H\Big], &(55)\\ \alpha_3 &= -1 - \frac{1}{2}X\frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X}. &(56)\end{aligned}$$

In order to analyze the mass spectrum of scalar perturbation, we hope to transfer the eq. (53) into a Schrödinger like equation. So we hope α_3 is a constant. The general form of $\mathcal{L}$ that satisfies this constraint is

$$\mathcal{L} = \gamma f(\phi)X^n - V(\phi). \tag{57}$$

Here $f(\phi)$ and $V(\phi)$ are arbitrary functions of ϕ; γ and n are real numbers, so that

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_{XX}}{\mathcal{L}_X}X = n-1, \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}}{\mathcal{L}_X}\phi' = \frac{f_\phi}{f}\phi' = \partial_y(\ln f), \tag{58}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_1 &= 2H\frac{J'}{J} - 2(n+1)H' + (n-1)H^2,\\ \alpha_2 &= \partial_r\ln\left(\frac{J}{a^{n+2}}\right), \quad \alpha_3 = -\frac{1}{2}(n+1).\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Here we have defined $J \equiv (\mathcal{L}_X\phi')^{\frac{(n+3)}{2}} f^{-1}$ and $H \equiv \frac{a'}{a}$. This Lagrange density contains a lot of interesting models.

Expanding $\Psi(r, x^\mu)$ as

$$\Psi(r, x^\mu) = \varphi(r)\left(\frac{J}{a^{n+2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+n}} e^{ip_\mu x^\mu}, \tag{60}$$

we can transfer eq. (53) into the following Schrödinger equation:

$$\bar{m}^2\varphi(r) = -\varphi(r)'' + V_{\text{eff}}(r)\varphi(r), \tag{61}$$

where

$$\bar{m}^2 = \frac{2m^2}{(1+n)}, \tag{62}$$

and the effective potential reads

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r) = c_1\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2 + c_2\frac{a'}{a}\frac{J'}{J} + c_3\left(\frac{J'}{J}\right)^2 - c_4\frac{a''}{a} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{J''}{J}, \tag{63}$$

the coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \frac{(4+9n+6n^2)}{(1+n)^2}, \quad c_2 = \frac{2n}{(1+n)^2}, \\ c_3 &= \frac{(2+n)}{(1+n)^2}, \quad c_4 = \frac{(2+3n)}{(1+n)}. \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

For the canonical scalar field, $\mathcal{L} = X - V$, we have $f(\phi) = 1$, $n = 1$ and $J = \phi'^2$, $\bar{m}^2 = m^2$. The coefficients of the potential is $c_1 = \frac{19}{4}, \quad c_2 = \frac{2}{4}, \quad c_3 = \frac{3}{4}, \quad c_4 = \frac{5}{2}$, and

$$V_{\text{eff}}(r) = -\frac{5}{2}\frac{a''}{a} + \frac{19}{4}\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^2 + \frac{a'}{a}\frac{\phi''}{\phi'} + 2\left(\frac{\phi''}{\phi'}\right)^2 - \frac{\phi'''}{\phi'}, \tag{65}$$

which consists with the results in [17, 19, 108, 110].

For general case, both the mass spectrum and the effective potential are modified. When $n < -1$, we get $\bar{m}^2 < 0$, so any solution is unstable in this case.

Obviously, the effective potential is determined only by the background solution. Thus, as a particular K-brane solution is given, we can discuss its stability by simply analyzing the corresponding effective potential. But we leave such special discussions to our future works.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOKS

In this paper, we generally discussed the linearization of at thick K-brane models. We obtained the most general linear perturbation equations which are independent from any gauge choice. Then we applied the scalar, tensor and vector decomposition to the metric perturbation. It turns out that each type of the perturbations evolves separately. Then, by defining a group of gauge-invariant variables, we rewritten the perturbation equations into some Schrödinger like equations. Note that in order to write the scalar perturbation equations into a Schrödinger like equation, we imposed a constraint on the Lagrangian of scalar field, namely,

$$\mathcal{L} = \gamma f(\phi) X^n - V(\phi), \tag{66}$$

where $f(\phi)$ and $V(\phi)$ are arbitrary functions of ϕ; γ and n are real numbers. For thick brane models with such a matter Lagrangian, the scalar perturbation equations can always be recast into a Schrödinger equation.

There is no modification for tensor and vector perturbation spectra in thick K-brane models, no matter what the matter Lagrangian is. Thus, as to the standard case $\mathcal{L} = X - V(\phi)$, if we want to have a finite four-dimensional Planck mass, we have to localize the tensor zero mode. Then, the vector zero mode cannot be localized. On the contrary, the appearance of non-standard kinetic terms does impact the mass spectrum and the effective potential of the scalar perturbation. We will discuss applications of our results of scalar perturbations to particular models in our future works.

We would like to stress that by using the longitude gauge, we cannot write the scalar perturbation equations of some models, such as domain wall branes generated by tachyonic fields [70, 79], into a Schrödinger equation. But, this problem might be solved by working in some other gauge choices. Since we have obtained the gauge invariant perturbation equations (36)-(43), we are ready to take any appropriate gauge or construct the corresponding gauge-invariant variables. We will consider this possibility in our following works.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Huan Hsin Tseng and Yu-Hsiang Lin for helpful discussions on the gravitational perturbations. This work was supported by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11075065), and the Huo Ying-Dong Education Foundation of Chinese Ministry of Education (No. 121106). Yuan Zhong was supported by the Scholarship Award for Excellent Doctoral Student granted by Ministry of Education.

Appendix A: Appendix

The linear perturbations of the connection, Ricci tensor, Ricci scalar are given by

$$\delta\Gamma^{P}_{MN} = \partial_{(M}h^{P}_{N)} - h_{MN}\frac{\partial^{P}a}{a} - \frac{1}{2}\partial^{P}h_{MN} + \eta_{MN}\frac{a'}{a}h^{P}_{r}, \tag{A1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta R_{MN} = {} & \partial_{P}\partial_{(M}h^{P}_{N)} - \frac{1}{2}\Box^{(5)}h_{MN} - \frac{3}{2}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{r}h_{MN} \\ & -\frac{a''}{a}h_{MN} - 2\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^{2}h_{MN} + \eta_{MN}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{P}h^{P}_{r} \\ & +\eta_{MN}\frac{a''}{a}h_{rr} + 2\eta_{MN}\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^{2}h_{rr} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_{M}\partial_{N}h \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\eta_{MN}\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{r}h + 3\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{(M}h_{N)r} - 2\frac{a'}{a}\frac{\partial_{(M}ah_{N)r}}{a} \\ & +2\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^{2}\eta_{r(M}h_{N)r},\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}a^{2}\delta R = {} & \Big(\partial_{M}\partial_{N}h^{MN} - \Box^{(5)}h - 4\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{r}h + 8\frac{a'}{a}\partial_{P}h^{P}_{r} \\ & +8\frac{a''}{a}h_{rr} + 4\left(\frac{a'}{a}\right)^{2}h_{rr}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

respectively.

The perturbation for the kinetic term X and the energy-momentum tensor T_{MN} are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta X &= a^{-2}(\frac{1}{2}h_{rr}\phi'^2 - \phi'\delta\phi'), && \text{(A4)}\\
\delta T_{MN} &= a^2 h_{MN}\mathcal{L} + \nabla_M\phi\nabla_N\phi\Big(\mathcal{L}_{X\phi}\delta\phi - \mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'\delta\phi' \\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_{XX}a^{-2}\phi'^2 h_{rr}\Big) + 2\mathcal{L}_X\nabla_{(M}\phi\nabla_{N)}\delta\phi \\
&\quad +\eta_{MN}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_X\phi'^2 h_{rr} - \mathcal{L}_X\phi'\delta\phi' + a^2\mathcal{L}_\phi\delta\phi\Big). && \text{(A5)}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the STV decomposition (28), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
h &= h_{rr} + 4A + \Box^{(4)}B, && \text{(A6a)}\\
\partial^M h_{Mr} &= \partial^r h_{rr} + \Box^{(4)}F, && \text{(A6b)}\\
\partial^M\partial^N h_{MN} &= \partial^r\partial^r h_{rr} + \Box^{(4)}(A + \Box^{(4)}B + 2F'). && \text{(A6c)}
\end{aligned}$$

[1] K. Akama, Lect.Notes Phys., **176**, 267 (1982), arXiv:hep-th/0001113 [hep-th].

[2] V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett., **B125**, 136 (1983).

[3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett., **83**, 3370 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9905221.

[4] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett., **83**, 4690 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9906064.

[5] V. A. Rubakov, Phys. Usp., **44**, 871 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0104152.

[6] C. Csaki, "Tasi lectures on extra dimensions and branes," (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0404096.

[7] M. Shifman, Int.J.Mod.Phys., **A25**, 199 (2010), arXiv:0907.3074 [hep-ph].

[8] K. Skenderis and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett., **B468**, 46 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9909070.

[9] N. Kaloper, Phys. Rev., **D60**, 123506 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9905210.

[10] A. Davidson and P. D. Mannheim, "Dynamical localization of gravity," (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0009064.

[11] O. DeWolfe, D. Z. Freedman, S. S. Gubser, and A. Karch, Phys. Rev., **D62**, 046008 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/9909134.

[12] O. Corradini and Z. Kakushadze, Phys. Lett., **B494**, 302 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0009022.

[13] M. Gremm, Phys. Lett., **B478**, 434 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/9912060.

[14] M. Gremm, Phys. Rev., **D62**, 044017 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0002040.

[15] C. Csaki, J. Erlich, T. J. Hollowood, and Y. Shirman, Nucl. Phys., **B581**, 309 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0001033.

[16] M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev., **D64**, 124004 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0107233.

[17] M. Giovannini, Phys.Rev., **D64**, 064023 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0106041 [hep-th].

[18] A. Campos, Phys. Rev. Lett., **88**, 141602 (2002).

[19] S. Kobayashi, K. Koyama, and J. Soda, Phys. Rev., **D65**, 064014 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0107025.

[20] K. A. Bronnikov and B. E. Meierovich, Grav. Cosmol., **9**, 313 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0402030.

[21] D. Z. Freedman, C. Nunez, M. Schnabl, and K. Skenderis, Phys. Rev., **D69**, 104027 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0312055.

[22] D. Bazeia, C. Furtado, and A. R. Gomes, JCAP, **0402**, 002 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0308034.

[23] D. Bazeia, F. A. Brito, and L. Losano, JHEP, **11**, 064 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0610233.

[24] V. I. Afonso, D. Bazeia, and L. Losano, Phys. Lett., **B634**, 526 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0601069.

[25] V. I. Afonso, D. Bazeia, R. Menezes, and A. Y. Petrov, Phys. Lett., **B658**, 71 (2007), arXiv:0710.3790 [hep-th].

[26] V. Dzhunushaliev, V. Folomeev, and M. Minamitsuji, Rept. Prog. Phys., **73**, 066901 (2010), arXiv:0904.1775 [gr-qc].

[27] V. Dzhunushaliev, V. Folomeev, K. Myrzakulov, and R. Myrzakulov, Gen. Rel. Grav., **41**, 131 (2009), arXiv:0705.4014 [gr-qc].

[28] V. Dzhunushaliev, V. Folomeev, and M. Minamitsuji, Phys. Rev. D, **79**, 024001 (2009).

[29] V. Dzhunushaliev, V. Folomeev, B. Kleihaus, and J. Kunz, JHEP, **04**, 130 (2010), arXiv:0912.2812 [gr-qc].

[30] Y.-X. Liu, K. Yang, and Y. Zhong, JHEP, **10**, 069 (2010), arXiv:0911.0269 [hep-th].

[31] Y. Zhong, Y.-X. Liu, and K. Yang, Phys. Lett., **B699**, 398 (2011), arXiv:1010.3478 [hep-th].

[32] Y.-X. Liu, Y. Zhong, Z.-H. Zhao, and H.-T. Li, JHEP, **06**, 135 (2011), arXiv:1104.3188 [hep-th].

[33] E. M. Abreu, Phys.Lett., **B704**, 322 (2011).

[34] M. Carrillo-Gonzalez, G. German, and A. Herrera-Aguilar, (2012), arXiv:1210.0597 [hep-th].

[35] T. Carames, M. Guimaraes, and J. H. da Silva, (2012), arXiv:1205.4980 [gr-qc].

[36] J. Yang, Y.-L. Li, Y. Zhong, and Y. Li, Phys.Rev., **D85**, 084033 (2012), arXiv:1202.0129 [hep-th].

[37] G. Alencar, R. Landim, M. Tahim, and R. C. Filho, (2012), arXiv:1207.3054 [hep-th].

[38] A. Ahmed and B. Grzadkowski, (2012), arXiv:1210.6708 [hep-th].

[39] M. Visser, Phys. Lett., **B159**, 22 (1985).

[40] A. Pomarol, Phys.Lett., **B486**, 153 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9911294 [hep-ph].

[41] S. L. Dubovsky and V. A. Rubakov, Int. J. Mod. Phys., **A16**, 4331 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0105243.

[42] Y.-X. Liu, X.-H. Zhang, L.-D. Zhang, and Y.-S. Duan, JHEP, **02**, 067 (2008), arXiv:0708.0065 [hep-th].

[43] Y.-X. Liu, L.-D. Zhang, S.-W. Wei, and Y.-S. Duan, JHEP, **08**, 041 (2008), arXiv:0803.0098 [hep-th].

[44] M. Gogberashvili, P. Midodashvili, and L. Midodashvili, Phys.Lett., **B707**, 169 (2012), arXiv:1105.1866 [hep-th].

[45] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto, and N. Sakai, "Matter Fields and Non-Abelian Gauge Fields Localized on Walls," (2012), arXiv:1208.6219 [hep-th].

[46] B. Bajc and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Lett., **B474**, 282 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/9912232.

[47] C. Ringeval, P. Peter, and J.-P. Uzan, Phys. Rev., **D65**, 044016 (2002),

arXiv:hep-th/0109194.

[48] A. Melfo, N. Pantoja, and J. D. Tempo, Phys. Rev., **D73**, 044033 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0601161.

[49] C. A. S. Almeida, M. M. Ferreira, Jr., A. R. Gomes, and R. Casana, Phys. Rev., **D79**, 125022 (2009), arXiv:0901.3543 [hep-th].

[50] Y.-X. Liu, J. Yang, Z.-H. Zhao, C.-E. Fu, and Y.-S. Duan, Phys. Rev., **D80**, 065019 (2009), arXiv:0904.1785 [hep-th].

[51] Y.-X. Liu, C.-E. Fu, L. Zhao, and Y.-S. Duan, Phys. Rev., **D80**, 065020 (2009), arXiv:0907.0910 [hep-th].

[52] J. Liang and Y.-S. Duan, Phys. Lett., **B681**, 172 (2009).

[53] J. Liang and Y.-S. Duan, Europhys. Lett., **87**, 40005 (2009).

[54] Z.-H. Zhao, Y.-X. Liu, H.-T. Li, and Y.-Q. Wang, Phys. Rev., **D82**, 084030 (2010), arXiv:1004.2181 [hep-th].

[55] Z.-H. Zhao, Y.-X. Liu, and H.-T. Li, Class. Quant. Grav., **27**, 185001 (2010), arXiv:0911.2572 [hep-th].

[56] Y.-X. Liu, H. Guo, C.-E. Fu, and J.-R. Ren, JHEP, **02**, 080 (2010), arXiv:0907.4424 [hep-th].

[57] Y.-X. Liu, H. Guo, C.-E. Fu, and H.-T. Li, Phys. Rev. D, **84**, 044033 (2011), arXiv:1101.4145 [hep-th].

[58] Z.-H. Zhao, Y.-X. Liu, Y.-Q. Wang, and H.-T. Li, JHEP, **06**, 045 (2011), arXiv:1102.4894 [hep-th].

[59] B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Sen, S. Sen, and S. SenGupta, Phys.Rev., **D70**, 066009 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0403098 [hep-th].

[60] B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Sen, and S. SenGupta, Phys.Rev., **D76**, 121501 (2007), arXiv:0709.3428 [hep-th].

[61] M. O. Tahim, W. T. Cruz, and C. A. S. Almeida, Phys. Rev., **D79**, 085022 (2009), arXiv:0808.2199 [hep-th].

[62] G. Alencar, M. Tahim, R. Landim, C. Muniz, and R. Costa Filho, Phys.Rev., **D82**, 104053 (2010), arXiv:1005.1691 [hep-th].

[63] H. R. Christiansen, M. S. Cunha, and M. O. Tahim, Phys. Rev., **D82**, 085023 (2010), arXiv:1006.1366 [hep-th].

[64] C.-E. Fu, Y.-X. Liu, and H. Guo, "Bulk matter fields on two-field thick branes," (2011), arXiv:1101.0336 [hep-th].

[65] Y.-X. Liu, C.-E. Fu, H. Guo, and H.-T. Li, Phys. Rev. D, **85**, 084023 (2012), arXiv:1102.4500 [hep-th].

[66] C.-E. Fu, Y.-X. Liu, K. Yang, and S.-W. Wei, JHEP, **1210**, 060 (2012), arXiv:1207.3152 [hep-th].

[67] Y.-X. Liu, X.-N. Zhou, K. Yang, and F.-W. Chen, Phys.Rev., **D86**, 064012 (2012), arXiv:1107.2506 [hep-th].

[68] A. Karch and L. Randall, JHEP, **05**, 008 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0011156.

[69] V. Bozza, M. Gasperini, and G. Veneziano, Nuclear Physics B, **619**, 191 (2001), ISSN 0550-3213.

[70] D. Bazeia, F. A. Brito, and J. R. Nascimento, Phys. Rev. D, **68**, 085007 (2003).

[71] R. Koley and S. Kar, Phys.Lett., **B623**, 244 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0507277 [hep-th].

[72] R. Koley and S. Kar, Mod.Phys.Lett., **A20**, 363 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0407159 [hep-th].

[73] C. Adam, N. Grandi, J. Sanchez-Guillen, and A. Wereszczynski, J. Phys., **A41**, 212004 (2008), arXiv:0711.3550 [hep-th].

[74] C. Adam, N. Grandi, P. Klimas, J. Sanchez-Guillen, and A. Wereszczynski, J.Phys., **A41**, 375401 (2008), arXiv:0805.3278 [hep-th].

[75] V. Dzhunushaliev, V. Folomeev, S. Myrzakul, and R. Myrzakulov, (2008), arXiv:0804.0151 [gr-qc].

[76] D. Bazeia, A. R. Gomes, L. Losano, and R. Menezes, Phys. Lett., **B671**, 402 (2009), arXiv:0808.1815 [hep-th].

[77] Y.-X. Liu, Y. Zhong, and K. Yang, Europhys. Lett., **90**, 51001 (2010), arXiv:0907.1952 [hep-th].

[78] L. B. Castro and L. A. Meza, (2010), arXiv:1011.5872 [hep-th].

[79] G. German, A. Herrera-Aguilar, D. Malagon-Morejon, R. R. Mora-Luna, and R. da Rocha, (2012), arXiv:1210.0721 [hep-th].

[80] D. Bazeia, F. Brito, and F. Costa, (2012), arXiv:1210.6318 [hep-th].

[81] D. Bazeia, J. Lobao, A.S., and R. Menezes, (2012), arXiv:1210.6874 [hep-th].

[82] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour, and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett., **B458**, 209 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9904075.

[83] J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys.Lett., **B458**, 219 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9904176 [hep-th].

[84] C. Armendariz-Picon, V. F. Mukhanov, and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys.Rev., **D63**, 103510 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0006373 [astro-ph].

[85] N. Nunes and M. Peloso, Phys.Lett., **B623**, 147 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0506039 [hep-th].

[86] M. Olechowski, Phys.Rev., **D78**, 084036 (2008), arXiv:0801.1605 [hep-th].

[87] D. Maity, S. SenGupta, and S. Sur, Class.Quant.Grav., **26**, 055003 (2009), arXiv:hep-th/0609171 [hep-th].

[88] W. D. Goldberger and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett., **83**, 4922 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9907447.

[89] J. Lesgourgues and L. Sorbo, Phys. Rev. D, **69**, 084010 (2004).

[90] V. Mukhanov, *Physical Foundations Of Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[91] I. Y. Aref'eva, M. G. Ivanov, W. Mueck, K. S. Viswanathan, and I. V. Volovich, Nucl. Phys., **B590**, 273 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0004114.

[92] Z. Kakushadze and P. Langfelder, Mod.Phys.Lett., **A15**, 2265 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0011245 [hep-th].

[93] A. Iglesias and Z. Kakushadze, Int. J. Mod. Phys., **A16**, 3603 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0011111.

[94] P. D. Mannheim, "Brane-localized gravity," (World Scientific, Singapore, 2005).

[95] J. Scherk and J. Schwarz, Gen. Rel. Gray., **6**, 537 (1975).

[96] M. Goroff and J. H. Schwarz, Physics Letters B, **127**, 61 (1983), ISSN 0370-2693.

[97] S. Randjbar-Daemi and M. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys., **B645**, 188 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0206016 [hep-th].

[98] M. Shaposhnikov, P. Tinyakov, and K. Zuleta, JHEP, **09**, 062 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0508102.

[99] S. Parameswaran, S. Randjbar-Daemi, and A. Salvio, JHEP, **0801**, 051 (2008), arXiv:0706.1893 [hep-th].

[100] J. M. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. D, **22**, 22 (1980).

[101] H. Kodama and M. Sasaki, Progr. Theoret. Phys. Suppl., **78**, 1 (1984).

[102] J. chan Hwang, Astrophys. J., **375**, 443 (1991).

[103] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman, and R. H. Brandenberger, Physics Reports, **215**, 203 (1992), ISSN 0370-1573.

[104] R. H. Brandenberger, Lect. Notes Phys., **646**, 127 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0306071.

[105] M. Giovannini, Int.J.Mod.Phys., **D14**, 363 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0412601 [astro-ph].

[106] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

[107] K. A. Malik and D. Wands, Physics Reports, **475**, 1 (2009), ISSN 0370-1573.

[108] C. Csaki, M. L. Graesser, and G. D. Kribs, Phys. Rev., **D63**, 065002 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0008151.

[109] M. Giovannini, Phys.Rev., **D65**, 064008 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0106131 [hep-th].

[110] A. Wang, Phys. Rev., **D66**, 024024 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0201051.

[111] M. Giovannini, Class.Quant.Grav., **20**, 1063 (2003), arXiv:gr-qc/0207116 [gr-qc].

[112] M. Toharia, M. Trodden, and E. J. West, Phys. Rev. D, **82**, 025009 (2010).

[113] S. M. Aybat and D. P. George, JHEP, **09**, 010 (2010), arXiv:1006.2827 [hep-th].

[114] D. P. George, Phys. Rev., **D83**, 104025 (2011), arXiv:1102.0564 [hep-th].

[115] T. Gherghetta and M. Peloso, (2011), arXiv:1109.5776 [hep-ph].

[116] G. F. R. Ellis and M. Bruni, Phys. Rev. D, **40**, 1804 (1989).

[117] R. Maartens and K. Koyama, Living Rev. Rel., **13**, 5 (2010), arXiv:1004.3962 [hep-th].